

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on November 29, 2005, in which claims 1, 7, 12-14, and 19 were rejected, claim 11 was objected to, and claims 17 and 18 were allowed.

Claims 1, 7, 12-14, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Lantsman, U.S. Patent No. 6,027,068 in view of Rieth, U.S. Patent No. 3,614,016. Claims 1 and 12, as amended, now include the limitation set forth in claim 11, which the Examiner stated would be allowable over the prior art of record if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, claims 1 and 12, as amended, are allowable. Similarly, claims 7, 11, 13, 14, and 19, which depend from claims 1 and 12 are also allowable.

In the Office Action, claims 15 and 16 stand withdrawn from consideration pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.142(b) as being drawn to a non-elected species, and which are not dependant on an allowable generic or linking claim. Claim 12, which is a generic claim that claims 15 and 16 depend from, is amended to be placed in condition for allowance. As such, under 37 C.F.R. § 1.142(b), Applicants respectfully requests that the withdrawn claims 15 and 16 be reinstated and allowed.

CONCLUSION

Because the prior art made of record does not show, suggest, or teach all the limitations in claims 1, 7, and 11-19, these claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
KINNEY & LANGE, P.A.

Date: 01/26/06

By: Michael J. Pape
Michael J. Pape, Reg. No. 45,971
THE KINNEY & LANGE BUILDING
312 South Third Street
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1002
Telephone: (612) 339-1863
Fax: (612) 339-6580